Application No.: 10/583,044 Amendment Dated: May 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action of: February 18, 2010

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claims 1-3 are pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that an innermost surface of the inner circumferential portion is disposed on a top surface of the supporting section and is coupled to the voice coil body via only an adhesive. Claim 2 has been amended similar to claim 1, namely, that an innermost surface of the inner circumferential portion is coupled to the voice coil body via an adhesive. No new matter is introduced herein. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 4, line 22 - page 5, line 12 and Fig. 2 of the subject specification.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, it is asserted that the phrase "coupled via only an adhesive to the voice coil body," as recited in claim 1 is unclear. It is asserted that because the claim recites that the portion is disposed on a top portion of the supporting section, this "would imply that the said portion is coupled to the voice coil body through the supporting section as well."

With respect to claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the innermost surface of the inner circumferential portion is disposed on a top surface of the supporting section and coupled to the voice coil body via only an adhesive. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants note that neither of claim 2 nor claim 3 recites that the inner circumferential portion is coupled via "only" an adhesive to the voice coil body. Thus, the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/583,044 Amendment Dated: May 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action of: February 18, 2010

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Proni (U.S. 6,088,466). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

- ... a supporting section attached to the voice coil bodv...
- ... the suspension holder has an inner circumferential portion which is spaced apart from the voice coil body, an innermost surface of the inner circumferential portion is disposed on a top surface of the supporting section and is coupled to the voice coil body via only an adhesive, ... (Emphasis Added)

Proni discloses, in Figs. 2a-2c, loudspeaker 20 including cone 24, spider 38, frame 22, voice coil former 43 and voice coil adapter ring 50. (Col. 6, line 66-Col. 7, line 17). Spider 38 and cone 24 are attached and adhered to ledge 58 of adapter ring 50. Adapter ring 50 is attached to an upper end of voice coil former 43 at upper collar 54. (Col. 8, lines 22-34).

Proni, however, does not disclose or suggest a suspension holder having an innermost surface of an inner circumferential portion disposed on a top surface of a supporting section and coupled to a voice coil body via only an adhesive, as required by claim 1 (emphasis added). Instead, Proni teaches that spider 38 is coupled to voice coil former 43 via voice coil adapter ring 50. Thus, Proni does not include all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2, as amended, includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

- a cylindrical supporting section attached to the voice coil body ...
- suspension holder has inner circumferential portion which is spaced apart form the voice coil body, an innermost surface of the inner circumferential portion is disposed on a top surface of

Application No.: 10/583,044 Amendment Dated: May 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action of: February 18, 2010

the supporting section and is <u>coupled to the voice coll</u> <u>body via an adhesive</u> ... (Emphasis Added)

Proni is discussed above. Proni does not disclose or suggest a suspension holder having an innermost surface of an inner circumferential portion disposed on a top surface of a supporting section and coupled to a voice coil body via an adhesive, as required by claim 2 (emphasis added). Instead, spider 38 (i.e., a suspension holder) of Proni is coupled to voice coil former 43 via voice coil adapter ring 50. Thus, Proni does not include all of the features of claim 2. Accordingly, allowance of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 3, this ground for rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 3 includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

... the inner circumferential portion <u>extending</u> <u>upwardly</u> from the top surface of the supporting section ... (emphasis added).

On page 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Proni teaches an inner circumferential portion that extends "upwardly from the top surface of the supporting section (53)." Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants note that the Examiner has not indicated where an inner circumferential portion which extends upwardly is shown in Fig. 2b of Proni. Applicants also note that Fig. 2b of Proni shows that spider 38 (i.e., a suspension holder) extends out from ledge 58. In contrast, Applicants' claim 3 recites that the inner circumferential portion (of the suspension holder) extends upwardly from the supporting section. Thus, Proni does not include all of the features of claim 3. Accordingly, allowance of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/583,044

Amendment Dated: May 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action of: February 18, 2010

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

espectfully submitted

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515 Attorney for Applicants

DMG/dmw

Dated: May 6, 2010

P.O. Box 980 Valley Forge, PA 19482 (610) 407-0700

SH_640665